



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/804,034

03/19/2004

Paul Lapstun

NPA136US

7056

24011 7590 06/27/2008
SILVERBROOK RESEARCH PTY LTD
393 DARLING STREET
BALMAIN, 2041
AUSTRALIA

EXAMINER

PHAM, THIERRY L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/27/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/804,034	Applicant(s) LAPSTUN ET AL.	
	Examiner THIERRY L. PHAM	Art Unit 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 4-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/4/08</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

- This action is responsive to the following communication: an amendment filed on 4/8/08.
- Claims 1, 4-9 are currently pending; claims 2-3 have been canceled.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 5/4/08 was filed after the mailing date of the non-final rejection on 1/8/2008. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 4-5, 7-9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lopresti et al (US 5754308).

Regarding claim 1, Lopresti discloses a copier (*copier 30, fig. 2*) including:

- a scanner (*copier 30 includes a scanner for scanning document data and decoding the DocID located on the document to be reproduced, fig. 2, col. 4, lines 6-8*) for scanning a surface of a document, the document having document content;
- an archiving means (*DocIDs are assigned and stored by archive server 32, fig. 2, col. 7, lines 35 to col. 8, lines 23*) arranged to archive the scanned document in a computer system (*archive server 32 is networked with copier 30, fig. 2*) networked with the copier as a digital version of the document (*retrieving digital representation of the document*

Art Unit: 2625

content via using decoded DocID, wherein digital representation is stored in remote archive server 32, fig. 2, col. 4, lines 14-49);

- a coded data generator (*generates and assigns DocID, col. 7, lines 25-50*) arranged to generate coded data which identifies the digital version (*electronic version, col. 7, lines 9-32*) of the document stored by the computer system (*DocIDs are assigned and stored by archive server 32, fig. 2, col. 7, lines 35 to col. 8, lines 23*).; and
- a printer (*copier machine as shown in fig. 3 includes a print engine for outputting scanned data onto the print media, fig. 3 & 5, col. 8, lines 8-10*) for printing a copy of the digital version of the scanned document and for incorporating (*printing/copying a “scanned” document along with newly DocID, col. 7, lines 35 to col. 8, lines 13*) in said printed copy document content and said coded data.

Regarding claim 4, Lopresti further discloses a copier according to claim 1 wherein said copier is adapted to communicate with a server (copier machine 30 is communicated with archive server 32, fig. 2) for allocating a unique identifier (fig. 4) to each copy.

Regarding claim 5, Lopresti further discloses a copier according to claim 4 wherein data indicative of said unique identifier (identifier, col. 8, lines 14-26) is incorporated into said second coded data (new DocID or “banks” of DocIDs, col. 8, lines 14-26) and is printed in said printed copy.

Regarding claim 7, Lopresti further discloses a copier according to claim 2 further adapted to transmit through said network interface (network as shown in fig. 2) second document data representing said copy of the document to enable said second document data to be stored.

Regarding claim 8, Lopresti further discloses a copier according to claim 7 wherein said second document data can be retrieved through said network interface

Art Unit: 2625

(document retrieved network interface, fig. 4) to enable reproduction of said copy with both document content and coded data.

Regarding claim 9, Lopresti further discloses a copier according to claim 1, wherein the printer is further adapted to incorporate (printing/copying a “scanned” document along with newly DocID, col. 7, lines 35 to col. 8, line 13) in said printed copy portions of said document content as scanned by the scanner not contained (newly DocID not previously in digital version of document, col. 7, lines 35 to col. 8, line 13) in said digital version of the document in accordance with said user request (user request, fig. 5) determined from the scanned user input.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lopresti described in claim 1 above, and further in view of Dymetman et al (US 6330976).

Regarding claim 6, Lopresti teaches a second coded data indicative of an identity of the copy, but fail to teach and/or suggest wherein a second coded data device is indicative of a plurality of reference points on a printed copy to identify the position of the sensing device relative to the copy.

Dymetman, in the same field of endeavor for printing, teaches a second coded data indicative of an identity of the copy, but fails to teach and/or suggest wherein a second coded data device (col. 3, lines 50-67 and col. 9, lines 15-21) is indicative of a plurality of reference points on a printed copy to identify the position (location identifier coded data for identifying location of a photograph, zone, and etc within a document, col. 3, lines 58-67 and col. 8, lines 60-67) of the sensing device relative to the copy.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Lopresti invention to include coded data identifying a position of the sensing device relative to the copy as taught by Dymetman because of a following reason: (●) adding a location identifier coded data to identify the position of the sensing device relative to the copy helps user to easily locate the location of the tags.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Lopresti with Dymetman to obtain the invention as specified in claim 6.

Response to Arguments

- Applicant's arguments filed 4/8/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claim 1, the applicants argued the cited prior arts of record fail to teach and/or suggest a copier which scans a document, archives a digital version of the scanned document, assigns an identity to the digital version as a coded data and prints a copy of the digital version with the coded data.

In response, the examiner fully disagrees. Lopresti clearly teaches a copier which scans *(copier 30 includes a scanner for scanning document data and decoding the DocID located on the document to be reproduced, fig. 2, col. 4, lines 6-8)* a document, archives a digital version *digital representation is stored in remote archive server 32, fig. 2, col. 4, lines 14-49)* of the scanned document, assigns an identity *(DocIDs are assigned and stored by archive server 32, fig. 2, col. 7, lines 35 to col. 8, lines 23)* to the digital version as a coded data and prints *(copier machine as shown in fig. 3 includes a print engine for outputting scanned data onto the print media, fig. 3 & 5, col. 8, lines 8-10)* a copy of the digital version with the coded data.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the

Art Unit: 2625

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to THIERRY L. PHAM whose telephone number is (571)272-7439. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30 AM - 6:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Coles can be reached on (571)272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Thierry L Pham/

Art Unit 2625

/Edward L. Coles/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625